R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 512 UD 005 151

EVALUATION OF 1966 EOA SECONDARY SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM.
RESEARCH REPORT.
BY- GODON, ROLF M.
OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS, CALIF.
REPORT NUMBER OPS-2 PUB DATE 22 SEP 66
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.20 28P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SUMMER SCHOOLS, *JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, CORE COURSES, STUDENT ATTITUDES, TEACHER ATTITUDES, PARENT ATTITUDES, ATTENDANCE, SPECIAL SERVICES, FIELD TRIPS, ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES, DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS, TABLES (DATA), QUESTIONNAIRES, FEDERAL PROGRAMS, NUTRITION, TEST RESULTS, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

PRESENTED IS AN EVALUATION OF A 6-WEEK SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM FOR 502 DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS ENTERING JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE FALL OF 1966. PROGRAM GOALS WERE TO RAISE ACHIEVEMENT LEVELS, REDUCE SUMMER LEARNING LOSSES, ENCOURAGE ASPIRATION AND MOTIVATION FOR LEARNING, AND PROVIDE ENRICHMENT. THESE OBJECTIVES WERE IMPLEMENTED BY INTENSIVE REQUIRED CORE PROGRAMS IN READING, LANGUAGE ARTS, AND MATHEMATICS AND BY SOME ELECTIVE CLASSES. FIELD TRIPS, FREE NUTRITIONAL SNACKS, GUIDANCE PERSONNEL, A READING CONSULTANT, AND A NURSE WERE ALSO PROVIDED. THE APPRAISAL OF THE PROGRAM IS BASED ON PRE- AND POST-ACHIEVEMENT TEST RESULTS, STUDENT, TEACHER, AND PARENT OPINIONS AS MEASURED BY QUESTIONNAIRES, ATTENDANCE RATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS OF THE SPECIAL SERVICES. DROPOUT AND ABSENCE RATES WERE HIGH. MOST OF THE 22 TEACHERS FELT THAT STUDENTS HAD MADE "SOME" IMPROVEMENT OF A "SATISFACTORY NATURE," ESPECIALLY IN MOTIVATION AND ATTITUDE CHANGES. TEACHERS ALSO FELT THAT CLASS SESSIONS WERE TOO LONG AND THAT THE PROCEDURES FOR SCREENING AND SELECTING STUDENTS NEEDED IMPROVEMENT. MOST OF THE STUDENTS AND PARENTS SEEMED SATISFIED. THE MAJOR USE OF THE GUIDANCE SERVICES WAS FOR DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS. TEST RESULTS SHOW GAINS IN ALL AREAS EXCEPT SPELLING. (NH)

ED018512

05151

RESEARCH REPORT

EVALUATION OF 1966 EOA SECONDARY SUMMER SCHOOLS

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1966-67

Report Number 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF THE 1966 EOA SECONDARY SUMMER SCHOOL PROGRAM

Prepared By:

Oakland Public Schools Research Department

In Cooperation With:

Oakland Public Schools Secondary Division

Department of Special Urban Educational Services

UD 005 151

EVALUATION REPORT OF THE EOA SECONDARY SUMMER SCHOOLS--1966

INTRODUCTION

A six week summer school program was provided at Hamilton Junior High School for approximately 500 students entering junior high school classes in the fall (seventh, eighth and ninth grades).

The primary objectives of the program were to: a) increase achievement levels; b) reduce summer learning losses; c) stimulate aspiration and motivation for learning and d) enrich the experiential background of students whose restricted knowledge and interests tend to handicap them in their educational progress.

These objectives were implemented by intensive required core programs in reading and language arts, emphasis on mathematics. Electives were provided in mathematics, art, science, shop, and homemaking. Small classes allowed for individual attention. Numerous field trips were available, and finally, a number of special services were provided.

The total enrollment at the beginning of the summer session was 502. This was composed of 52% boys and 48% girls. Seventh graders made up 54% of the total enrollment, while eighth graders made up 28% and ninth graders 18%. The student body was composed of students from 56 elementary schools, junior high schools, and parochial schools. Complete data regarding feeder schools may be found in appendix A.

A total of 22 teachers were employed during summer school. Of these, eleven taught reading, seven arithmetic, one science, one art, two homemaking, and two shop. Classes ranged in size from 19-25.

A full time nurse, a full time guidance consultant, a reading consultant and a counselor were employed. In addition, there were four full time counselor interns present. The nurse spent a sizable proportion of her time in health education. The counselor and counselor interns were involved in numerous activities outside of counseling, such as supervision and observation.

The library was open daily and included the services of a full time librarian. Books could be checked out for one week. Language teachers brought their classes to the library to encourage the checking out of books and extra-curricular reading.

Free nutrition (milk, orange slice, roll) was served daily to all students by the cafeteria. This occured during the break between first and second period (10:20 - 10:40). Students lined up in the cafeteria to receive the food.

Assemblies were scheduled every Friday and included films, musical presentations, and talks. There were extensive field trips to Sacramento, University of California, Alameda County Fair, Angel Island and Fisherman's Wharf. In addition, individual classes partook in several walking excursions to areas such as the Oakland Estuary, Chabot Science Center, and Diamond Park.

PURPOSE

It is the purpose of this report to describe and evaluate the summer school program in terms of the objectives set forth. The strategy employed includes the following:

A. Pre-post achievement test result comparisons to determine changes in achievement levels.
B. Evaluation of student, teacher, and parent opinions and attitudes by means of questionnaires.
C. Descriptions of special services provided.

METHOD

Attendance:

The customary daily attendance records were maintained, as well as a systematic appraisal of dropouts. The nurse made home telephone calls after a student was absent three times. She attempted to determine the cause of absence and to induce the student to return to school. Enrollment reports were compiled on June 20, June 29, July 15 and July 30. Figures were reported for boys, girls and totals as well as by grade level.

Opinions:

All teachers completed an evaluation questionnaire during the final week of summer school. They were to rate their classes in terms of how well they succeeded in meeting the original objectives. Following, were open-ended statements regarding positive and negative comments about the program, enrichment activities undertaken, instructional techniques and materials found effective, suggestions for improvement and value of the free nutrition provided to the students. This form is attached in appendix B1.

A modified random sampling of 25% of the student body was undertaken. This group was given a student evaluation form to complete. This attempt to tap their attitudes and feelings; both positive and negative; regarding their summer school experiences. The form may be found in appendix B2.

The aforementioned students were each given an evaluation form to take home to their parents. This questionnaire attempted to assess the parents' feelings regarding their child's progress during summer school as well as their interest in sending their child to summer school again. This form is attached in appendix B3.

Enrichment:

The reading consultant was responsible for coordinating excursions. She summarized excursion activities, a report of which will be presented in another section.

Teachers were asked to describe and rate the excursions they took with their classes

Special Services:

1. Guidance Consultants: Consultants kept a record of the hours, number of contacts, and types of services rendered.
2. Library: Librarians took spot checks on the number of books checked out during a day, as well as the usual library tasks such as checking on overdue books.
3. Health: The nurse kept the usual daily log of services performed.

Testing:

The Reading Vocabulary, Reading Comprehension, Mechanics of English, and Spelling subtests of the California Achievement Test, Junior High School Battery, Form W, were administered to all students during the first week of summer school. The same subtests, but using Form X, were administered during the last week of school.

In addition to the required testing, three arithmetic teachers administered the Arithmetic Reasoning and Fundamentals subtests to their classes on the same pre-post test schedule.

RESULTS

Attendance:

Enrollment as of the first day of summer school (June 20) was 502. Of this original total 52% were boys and 48% were girls. Furthermore, 54% of the students were seventh graders, 28% eighth graders and 18% ninth graders. At the end of the month attendance report the enrollment was down to 470, and as of the July 30 report the enrollment had further declined to 416, or a total dropout of 84 students. This represents 17% of the original enrollment. According to the attendance secretary the average absence rate per day was approximately 50, with a high of about 75.

A total of 56 elementary schools, junior high schools and parochial schools fed into the Hamilton summer school. These schools were rather uniformly scattered between the Berkeley and San Leandro borders of the Oakland district, with the greatest representation from the lower social-economic areas. Thirteen of the 56 feeder schools were parochial.

Table 1 summarizes the attendance data presented. A more complete reference, including contributions of each feeder school, and dropout data may be found in appendix A.

TABLE 1
Students enrolled in EOA Secondary Summer School, 1966

	BOYS			GIRLS			TOTAL			TOTAL
	7th	8th	9th	7th	8th	9th	7th	8th	9th	ENROLLMENT
June 20	151	66	46	121	75	43	272	141	89	502
June 29	138	63	40	117	73	39	225	136	79	470
July 15	128	62	36	97	67	34	225	129	70	424
July 30	126	61	36	95	67	31	221	128	67	416

1. Dropout data: It was deemed appropriate to analyze the dropout data more thoroughly due to the relatively high percentage (17%) of students involved.

a. General characteristics of the group

Boys and girls left school in about equal numbers. In this respect the "dropout" group is equivalent to the original and the "stay" groups. However, while the original population of students was composed of 54% seventh graders, 28% eighth graders and 18% ninth graders, the dropout group was made up of 53% seventh graders, 19% eighth graders and 28% ninth graders. This data is summarized in Table 2. About the same proportion of seventh graders left school, whereas a considerably lower proportion of eighth graders, and a higher proportion of ninth graders did.

TABLE 2
Composition of dropout and original EOA secondary summer school student population by grade level:

GROUP	7th	8th	9th
Dropouts	53%	19%	28%
Original Population	54%	28%	18%

b. Geographical considerations of dropout data:

Since feeder schools ranged the entire length of the Oakland School District it was felt that perhaps such factors as distance and geographical area might have been influential in determining school leaving.

A total of 30 out of the total 56 feeder schools contributed students who left school. This represents 54% of the total number of feeder schools.

Hamilton Junior High School is situated in the center of the school district. Feeder schools were almost equally distributed about it; twenty-two from the west and north and twenty from the east. However, the schools east of Hamilton contributed more dropouts and also a somehwat larger proportion of the total summer school population. Table 3 summarizes this data.

TABLE 3
Analysis of 1966 EOA secondary summer school dropout data by geographical area:

	*North & West	East
Feeder Schools	22	20
Schools with Dropouts	11 (50%)	15 (75%)
Number of Dropouts	25	37
Average Number of Dropouts per Feeder School	1.14	1.85
Average Number of Pupils per School	7.9	10.6

*Figures do not include parochial schools nor Hamilton itself.

It is interesting to note that of the seven feeder schools in north Oakland (north of MacArthur Blvd.) none contributed to the dropout factor. Actually twenty-two out of the twenty-five dropouts from north and west of Hamilton were from the area between Lake Merritt and Hamilton. On the other hand, in the area east of Hamilton the dropouts were fairly evenly distributed.

A further point of interest is that 30% of the dropouts came from three feeder schools (Hamilton, Roosevelt, and Lockwood). Of added significance is that these three schools contributed only 21% to the total original enrollment. Furthermore, this analysis adds credence to the elimination of distance of travel as a major dropout cause. As will be observed elsewhere in this evaluation, distance of travel to summer school was rarely mentioned by students or parents as a source of dissatisfaction.

In order to determine whether the dropout rate per school was significantly higher east of Hamilton than north and west the data was examined by means of Chi Square analysis. The difference proved to be non-significant. Therefore, although a higher percentage of schools east of Hamilton contributed dropouts than western and northern schools, in terms of numbers of dropouts, there was no significant difference.

c. Reasons for leaving school

A total of 84 students dropped out of summer school. Thirty students left between June 20 and June 29. Forty-six students left between June 29 and July 17. Eight students left between July 17 and July 30 (See Table 1).

As mentioned in an earlier section, the school nurse attempted to obtain the cause of absence and/or school leaving by a home telephone call. Table 4 summarizes the reasons for leaving obtained. As is indicated by Table 4, 29% of the dropouts left school or were dropped from the rolls due to excessive absence. In these cases, actual reasons for leaving school were not obtained. Another 20% left school by parent request such as "needed at home." Seventeen percent claimed illness as a dropout cause, and 10% stated that they were not interested.

TABLE 4

Reasons and frequency of leaving EOA secondary summer school, 1966

REASON	NUMBER AND PERCENT
*Attendance	24 (29%)
Parent Request	17 (20%)
Ill	14 (17%)
Not Interested	8 (10%)
Vacation	7 (8%)
Working	4 (5%)
Moved	4 (5%)
No Bus Fare	3 (4%)
Discipline	3 (4%)
TOTAL	84

*No reasons determined for the absences.

In a further attempt to investigate causes of school leaving an analysis of dropouts by class was undertaken. All students took two classes; language arts and an elective. Table 5 indicates that the class combinations including "non-academic" classes contributed, in proportion, the largest number of dropouts. This is a difficult finding to explain due to the multiplicity of causal factors including ones such as: method of programming students into classes, individual teacher factors, and cirriculum.

TABLE 5

Frequency of EOA secondary summer school (1966) dropouts per class combination

CLASS COMBINATION	NUMBER AND PERCENT
Reading-Arithmetic (5 sections). . .	25 (33%)
Reading-Art.	13 (17%)
Reading-Homemaking	11 (14%)
Reading-Arithmetic-Shop.	11 (14%)
Reading-Arithmetic-Homemaking. . . .	8 (10%)
Reading-Shop	5 (6%)
Reading-Science.	3 (4.0%)

Poverty level was investigated as to its possible influence on the dropout rate. The Economic Opportunity Act target areas were used to roughly differentiate between "poverty" and "non-poverty" areas. Interestingly enough, the dropouts were approximately evenly distributed between the two areas; 53% coming from within the "poverty" area and 47% from the "non-poverty" area.

A partial cause for the high dropout rate in this year's summer school may be the rigidity to which the attendance rule was adhered to. According to the principal, the rule of dropping a student after three absences was followed closely during the first three weeks of school. When it was discovered that the rate of leaving was high, the rule was relaxed.

In summary, Hamilton summer school experienced a high absence and dropout rate. Analysis of the dropout population revealed the following characteristics: boys and girls left in approximately even numbers; in comparison to the original population, a higher proportion of ninth graders and a lower proportion of eighth graders left school; although north and west Oakland had approximately the same number of feeder schools as east Oakland (east of Hamilton), the eastern area provided a greater proportion of students, more dropouts, and more schools contributing to the dropout factor; distance of travel to summer school did not seem to be a contributing factor; for many of these cases reasons for leaving school were not determined, while parent request, illness, and lack of interest were given by numerous students or their parents as reasons for leaving school; class combinations including "non-academic" subjects contributed a high proportion of the dropout population; poverty area, as defined by the Economic Opportunity Act target areas, did not differentiate the dropout group; and finally strictness of adherence to the absence rule of these absences caused many students to be dropped from the rolls.

As can be seen, numerous variables contributed to the dropout factor. There is no simple answer to this problem. Perhaps follow-up interviews of students who dropped out of summer school might shed more light on the situation and result in more appropriate screening and planning for future summer sessions.

Opinions:

1. Teachers' Evaluation of Summer School, 1966

Nineteen of the staff of twenty-two teachers returned evaluation forms during the last week of school. Table 6 indicates that the teachers felt that most students (59%) made satisfactory improvement in all areas listed. Two teachers of language arts felt there was no improvement in study habits. As can be seen from examination of Table 6, all teachers did not respond to each area. This was particularly true for the first two areas as they seem to apply only to those teaching language arts. The area of educational motivation was rated as showing more improvement than any of the other areas, while the areas of reading vocabulary and written language were rated as indicating the least improvement, in relation to other areas.

TABLE 6

Teachers' Estimates of Results Achieved During EOA Secondary Summer Program

AREAS RATED	MARKED IMPROVEMENT	SATISFACTORY IMPROVEMENT	MINIMAL IMPROVEMENT	NO IMPROVEMENT	TOTAL
1. Reading					13
a. Vocabulary	3 (23%)*	5 (38%)	5 (38%)		
b. Comprehension	1 (8%)	11 (85%)	1 (8%)		13
2. Language					
a. Oral	3 (23%)	8 (62%)	2 (15%)		13
b. Written		7 (54%)	6 (46%)		13
3. Study Habits	1 (6%)	11 (69%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	16
4. Educational Motivation	6 (35%)	8 (47%)	3 (18%)		17
TOTAL	14 (16%)	50 (59%)	19 (22%)	2 (2%)	85

*Percentages computed separately for each area.

The results of questions "5a" and "b" are summarized in Table 7. Appendix B1 contains a copy of the teacher evaluation form. The ratings were originally analyzed by type of class taught (see appendix C1), but since ratings by teachers of the various classes were very similar the data were pooled, resulting in one table. Table 7 indicates that the majority of responses (53%) were in the satisfactory improvement area. However, in this case, although the majority of responses (53%) indicated satisfactory improvement, there was also a large number of responses (36%) under marked improvement.

TABLE 7

Teachers' Estimates of Results Achieved During EOA Secondary Summer Program

AREAS RATED	MARKED IMPROVEMENT	SATISFACTORY IMPROVEMENT	MINIMAL IMPROVEMENT	NO IMPROVEMENT	TOTAL
Understanding of course content	10 (37%)*	15 (56%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	27
Performance in class	9 (33%)	14 (52%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	27
Appreciation of course content	10 (37%)	14 (52%)	2 (7%)	1 (4%)	27
TOTAL	29 (36%)	43 (53%)	6 (7%)	3 (4%)	81

*Percentages computed separately for each area.

In summarizing this data it is obvious that the overwhelming majority of teachers felt that their students had made at least some improvement in all areas rated. Furthermore, the improvement tended to be of a satisfactory nature. Motivation and attitude changes tended to be rated as showing marked improvement.

Questions six, ten, and eleven asked teachers to describe positive aspects of the summer school session. Although each of the three questions asked for different aspects, analysis revealed that interpretation of the three questions varied considerably. Responses of the same type were found in all three. As a result, responses to the three questions were combined, yielding a single table (Table 8). The eight areas listed include almost all of the responses to these three questions. Over half the comments made alluded to positive aspects of special services (27%) and available materials (27%). Under special services, counseling, reading consultant, library, nurse, and administration were each mentioned several times. The controlled reader was mentioned most frequently under materials available.

TABLE 8

Aspects of EOA secondary summer school which teachers liked most:

AREA	FREQUENCY
Special Services	20 (27%)*
Counseling. 5	
Reading Consultant. 4	
Library 6	
Nurse 3	
Administration. 2	
Materials Available.	20 (27%)
A-V, etc. (Controlled reader commonly cited)	
Magazines and Newspapers	9 (12%)
Small Classes Allowing for Closer Teacher-Pupil Relationship	7 (10%)
Use of Small Group Techniques.	5 (7%)
Multi-level a nd Programmed Materials.	5 (7%)
Unstructured Nature of Curriculum.	4 (6%)
Teen-age Tales	3 (4%)
TOTAL.	73

*Percentages computed from total frequency.

Questions seven and twelve asked for criticism and suggestions regarding the program. Here again there was considerable overlap between responses. Therefore, evaluative comments were pooled to yield Table 9. As might be expected, a few of the same comments regarding certain aspects of the program were regarded as positive by some and negative by others. For instance, although many disliked the long periods, there were one or two in favor of them. Some enjoyed the reduced structure imposed while others disliked the free atmosphere.

Table 9 indicates that a large proportion (28%) of teachers desired shorter periods, usually three of them. Many teachers (28%) also were critical of the screening and selection of students. Comments were made that there were too many discipline problems as well as students with a poor attitude.

TABLE 9

Most common teacher criticisms and suggestions regarding EOA secondary summer school, 1966:

AREA	FREQUENCY
Shorter Periods (usually 3).	15 (28%)*
Screening and Selection of Students. . . . . (Many in who don't profit & discipline cases)	15 (28%)
Discipline Problems.	7 (13%)
Lax Treatment of Class Control Screening for, etc.	
Excursions	5 (9%)
More Spread out more Begin them earlier	
Lavatory Breaks (elimination of)	5 (9%)
Grouping by Grade Level (a desire for)	3 (6%)
Improvement Criteria . . . . . e.g. - grades	3 (6%)
TOTAL.	53

*Percentages computed from total frequency.

Teacher evaluation of enrichment activities will be discussed under a separate heading.

Finally, teachers were asked to comment on the value of free food served during the break between classes. Sixteen teachers (84%) checked that they felt the food was of value while two (11%) felt it was not, and one teacher did not respond. The reasons teachers stated for feeling that the food was of value

tended to center around need. That is, they felt that many of the students received little or no food at home in the morning and therefore need the nutrition. Of the two teachers responding negatively, one stated that the children bring bags of candy and eat all the time anyway. The other teacher who responded negatively polled his class and found that elimination of the snack would not affect summer school attendance if there was free time instead.

In summary, it appears as if teachers particularly appreciated the abundance and availability of special services and materials. Also, there was widespread agreement that the class periods were too long, and that the screening and selection of students should be improved, due to the inclusion of hard core unmotivated and/or discipline problem students. This last comment seems to be related to the high drop-out rate and may be found to be a major contributing factor.

2. Student Evaluation of Summer School, 1966

Fifty-four girls and sixty-two boys or a total of 116 students filled out and returned student evaluation forms (see appendix B2 for a sample form). This represents very nearly a 100% return of the 25% sample of the student body.

As in the parent questionnaire, there appears to have been some difficulty in interpretation of grade level during the 1965-1966 school year. Accordingly, 45 students stated that they were sixth graders, 32 seventh graders, 23 eighth graders, 9 ninth graders and 7 no responses. As a result of this confusion, no attempt was made to make grade level comparisons.

Students were asked to indicate how much they liked summer school. Thirty-seven percent indicated that they "liked it very much"; 57% indicated that "it was all right"; and 5% "didn't like it very much".

Another question asked students to indicate how much they felt they had learned during the summer. Thirty-one percent indicated they had learned "a great deal", 56% said they learned "quite a bit", and 15% indicated a little improvement. All students felt they had learned at least a little.

Eighty-three percent of the students checked that they would advise their friends to come to summer school next year, while 16% indicated that they wouldn't. One wonders if this 16% was composed of the same students who had responded "not very much" and "a little" to the preceding questions.

Each student was asked to list the three things he liked best about summer school. Table 10 summarizes the response patterns obtained. As might be expected, the non-academic aspects of the program (excursions 59%, snacks 22%) received the largest amount of praise. However, it is refreshing to note that the language arts was given positive value by a substantial proportion (34%) of the students responding to the questionnaire. Numerous students (20%) also felt that the teachers were good. Many other aspects of the summer school experience were mentioned by fewer than five students. The excursions were particularly enjoyed.

TABLE 10
Aspects of EOA secondary summer school enjoyed the most by students

AREA	FREQUENCY & PERCENT
Excursions	68 (59%)*
Language Arts	40 (34%)
Reading	25
English	8
Language	3
Writing	2
Spelling	2
Snacks	25 (22%)
Teachers	23 (20%)
Assemblies	20 (17%)
Arithmetic	20 (17%)
Wood Shop	12 (10%)
Meeting New People	10 (9%)

*Percent of students listing responses. Since each student mentioned more than one response, percentages will total to more than 100%.

Students were also asked to list the three things they liked least about summer school (Table 11). Apparently many of the students were satisfied as 28% of the questionnaires had either no response to this item or the response of "nothing". It is of interest to note that some of same areas receiving a high proportion of the "dislike" responses also received a high proportion of the "like" responses. The number of responses in the "dislike" category was, however, considerably lower than for the "like category.

It may be concluded, from the student evaluation, that the large majority of students were satisfied with the academic as well as non-academic aspects of summer school.

TABLE 11
Aspects of EOA secondary summer school liked least by students:

AREA	FREQUENCY
No response (or nothing)	32 (28%)*
Language Arts	14 (12%)
Snacks	12 (10%)
Some Teachers	7 (6%)
Arithmetic	7 (6%)
Tests	5 (4%)
Some Students	5 (4%)

*Proportion of total number (116) responding.

3. Parent Evaluation of Summer School, 1966

Twenty-five percent of the students at Hamilton were given a questionnaire to take home for their parents to complete. This was done during the final week of school. Sixty-seven parent questionnaires were returned. This is approximately 70% of those sent out.

A copy of the parent evaluation may be found in appendix B3. Parents of boys and girls responded in approximately equal proportions. Twenty-six parents stated that their child had been in the sixth grade during the 1965-1966 school year; twenty-six were parents of seventh graders; nine were parents of eighth graders; one, a parent of a ninth grader; and, this item was not responded to by five parents. Apparently the item caused some confusion in interpretation, as seen by the grades mentioned. Therefore, no attempt will be made at evaluation by grade level.

Parents were asked to indicate how much they felt that their child had gained from summer school courses. Table 12 indicates that the great majority of parents felt that their child had gained "quite a bit" or "a great deal", irregardless of the particular subject taken. It is interesting to note that the combined areas of shop, art, science and homemaking were the only ones to receive more "a great deal" responses (55%) than those of "quite a bit" (39%). The proportion responding in these two categories is approximately the reverse of response proportions for language arts (25%, 66%) and for arithmetic (35%, 53%).

Parents were also asked to indicate how the summer school program might be improved. Interestingly enough, 42% of the parents did not respond to this item and another 24% indicated satisfaction with the program as it was. Five parents felt that a larger choice of subjects would be beneficial. There were other single suggestions including: more homework, more field trips, shorter session, longer session, closer to home, and report cards.

In summary, the large majority of parents responding to the questionnaire indicated that their child had made substantial gains in subject matter as well as interest in school. On the whole, they seemed to be satisfied with the summer school program.

Enrichment:

Assemblies were scheduled for every Friday during the summer session. In general, these assemblies were well received by the students (Table 10). Table 14 indicates the programs presented.

TABLE 14
Assembly pregrams presented at the EOA Secondary Summer Session, 1966

FRIDAY	TOPIC
1st.	Jazz Trio
2nd.	Talk on children, customs etc. in Africa
3rd.	Weldonian Band
4th.	No Program
5th.	Walt Disney's film "Moon Pilot"
6th.	Walt Disney's film "Horse with a Flying Tail" Cartoons

A number of bus excursions were undertaken by all or part of the student body. A description of the excursions follows:

1. The University of California, Berkeley campus, where students observed other students at work in the pottery and glass-blowing studios and had the opportunity of viewing not only an art show but also various shops and exhibits in the architectural building, Wurster Hall, and the Lowie Museum of Anthropology in Kroeber Hall; a visit to the Tower Room, the Campinile and a tour of the Student Union.
2. The Floriculture, Gems and Minerals, Commercial and $-H Exhibits, along with the Poultry and Livestock Sheds, at the Alameda County Fair in Pleasanton.

3. The Assembly and Senate Chambers, Committee Rooms, Supreme Court and Govenor's Quarters in the State Capitol building at Sacramento.
4. The attractions of nature, as well as a ride on the Elephant Train, at Angel Island State Park in Tiburon and the boat trip to and from.
5. The Maritime and Wax Museums, Balcutha Ship, Piers and Cost Plus Imports at Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco, along with a boat tour of the harbor.

Several of the foregoing were half-day trips but the majority were all-day activities.

As noted in Table 10, "excursions" received the largest proportion (59%) of student positive ratings of summer school.

Teachers were asked to rate the value of enrichment activities such as excursions and assemblies. Table 15 indicates that the majority of teachers (58%) felt that these activities were "quite valuable", while 16% found them "extremely valuable". It seems appropriate to state that, in general, teachers were in favor of the enrichment activities and felt that they were of value.

TABLE 15

Teachers' estimations of the value of enrichment activities in the EOA Secondary Summer School, 1966

VALUE OF ACTIVITIES	FREQUENCY & PERCENT
Extremely Valuable.	3 (16%)
Quite Valuable.	11 (58%)
Somewhat Valuable	5 (26%)
Little or No Value.	0 (0%)

The principal evaluated the excursions as follow:

> Excursions were long and more expensive ones this year, so students experienced fewer "trips" - This is one area the majority of the students enthusiastically anticipate. It may be wise to look at the 1965 summer school excursion program for comparison and consider more trips for students - more "walking" trips also help in our overall "expenses". Also except for one total school excursion, we feel excursions should be limited to <u>four</u> classes at a time.

In addition, he feels that:

> Reading Consultant is a very necessary and important person - she should not be tied down to planning excursions or anything else.

The principal had the following to say about assemblies:

> Assemblies need to be developed so that one is scheduled and carried through every <u>Friday</u>. Here is another area students enjoy. This year we used films for the first time - they were well received, yet there needs to be a variety- music, talks, films, etc..

By way of summary, one can say that the staff, administration, and students found the enrichment activities which were provided to be both interesting and educational; a very important aspect of the summer school program.

Special Services:

1. Guidance

As mentioned earlier there were four counselor interns and a full time guidance consultant provided. This produces a counselor-student ratio in the neighborhood of 1-100, a very favorable ratio by present standards. There was also an intern present part time, administering individual intelligence tests.

The guidance consultant devoted the bulk of his time to consultation and supervision of the interns and the guidance service. As can be seen in Table 16 the staff spent over one-third of its time involved in supervision, observation, excursions, etc. One-fifth of the time was spent in individual counseling, and another 20% was involved in staff consultation. This category includes consultation with supervisor, teachers, and administration. About 13% of the time was involved in group testing. The small amount of remaining time was spread out into services such as group counseling, parent interviews, agency contacts and individual testing.

TABLE 16

Guidance Services at Hamilton summer school analyzed by types of service, number of contacts, and number and percent of hours:

AREAS OF SERVICE	NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS INVOLVED	TOTAL HOURS	% OF TOTAL
Student Counseling (short-term)			
Individual	104	170½	21%
Group		38	5%
Student Counseling (long-term) (3 or more interviews)	49		
Parent Contacts			
At School	10	10½	1%
At Home	3	5	1-%
Agency Contacts	7	4	1-%
Testing			
Individual	15	21	3%
Group		101	13%
Staff Consultation		155	20%
Other*		290	36%
TOTAL		795	

*Includes supervision and observation (excursions, cafeteria, campus, classes, etc.).

It is refreshing to note that 16 out of 22 teachers, or 73% of the teaching staff, made referrals to the counselors. This is indicative of the widespread acceptance and use made of the service. It may be recalled that counseling services were given positive evaluation by several teachers in the teacher evaluation form (Table 8). The great majority of referrals (81%) were for discipline problems. Other referral causes are noted in Table 17.

TABLE 17
Categories of Referrals made to the guidance staff by teachers at Hamilton Junior High School Summer Session, 1966

REFERRALS REASON	% OF REFERRALS
Discipline Problems	81%
Learning Problems	10%
Maladjusted Students	7%
Withdrawn/passive Students	2%

A part of the guidance services included group counseling. Five groups, including 31 students, were in progress during the summer session. One group was composed of aggressive-acting out girls. The remaining groups were of a mixed nature.

In summary, it appears as if guidance services were well accepted and utilized by teachers. A good deal of counselor time was spent in non-counseling duties. The principal noted that there was a higher incidence of discipline cases during this summer session as compared to the one last summer. This statement and the fact that 81% of the referrals to counselors were for discipline problems leads one to believe that the discipline problem was larger than expected.

2. Library

Between 60 and 70 books a day were checked out of the library. A major problem was encountered in terms of book returns. The day before school was to close there were still a large number of books which hadn't been returned to the library. The most difficulty encountered was obtaining books held by students who had left school.

Testing:

As mentioned previously, the Reading Comprehension, Reading Vocabulary, Mechanics of English and Spelling sub-tests of the California Achievement Test Battery were administered to all students present during the first week of summer session and again during the final week. Makeup tests were administered to pick up as many students who had been absent as possible. Tests were machine scored and the results recorded on class record sheets. In order to obtain comparable pre-post test groups, matching was undertaken. Only those students ware retained who had completed at least one common subtest in both the pre and post test administration.

Tests were scored in terms of grade placement scores. It was not possible to obtain percentile scores as they are available only by grade level. Since grades were mixed in each classroom it was not deemed advisable to evaluate the data by grade level.

For each sub-test, the median, and first and third quartiles were computed. The pre and post test results were compared and a difference score computed using t he grade placement score. Thus is was possible to make observations regarding learning in the areas measured.

A look at Table 18 reveals small to substantial growth in three areas (one month to one year, two months) and regression (minus 2 months) in a fourth area, spelling. By way of explanation, it is assumed that at the end of the sixth grade a n average student would obtain a score of 6.9 on any sub-test. This convention follows for other grades. The case of Hamilton summer school is unique; there was no attempt to place students into classes according to grade level. Therefore, due to the mixed nature of each classroom it is difficult to determine what an average score for a class should be. An approximation can be made if one considers the enrollment to be dominated by upcoming seventh graders with lesser frequencies of eighth and ninth graders present. Using enrollment figures from June 29 as a basis, a weighted average yields the figure of seven years and one month. For the sake of discussion this figure of 7.1 will be used to represent the expected group average.

Taking a look at the Reading Comprehension sub-test results one finds the median to be approximately one year below that expected of "average" classes. The range indicates a wide spread of ability in this area. At least one student scored between the tenth and eleventh grade level. One also notes an overall improvement for the student body of between one month and four months, depending on which segment of the distripbution one is examining. Since the interval between the pre and post testing was about five weeks one would expect a growth of approximately one month. Those at the center of the distribution showed a growth of four months.

Turning to the Reading Vocabulary results one perceives some rather remarkable gain scores. The upper quarter of the group taking the test improved by one year and two months within this period of approximately one month. The group average, for the pretest was about two years below that expected while the post test average was approximately one year below.

Mechanics of English showed an overall growth of eight months by all segments of the group.

It is interesting to note that spelling, as measured by this test battery, showed a slight regression except by the upper quarter of this group. However, this seems to be the strongest area as the average is only two to four months below expected.

TABLE 18
California Achievement Test
Junior High (Total)

	READING COMPREHENSION			READING VOCABULARY		
	June 22	July 27	Differences	June 22	July 27	Differences
Grade Equivalent						
Q3	6.8*	7.0	+0.2	6.3	7.5	+1.2
Mdn	5.8	6.2	+0.4	5.2	6.0	+0.8
Q1	5.1	5.2	+0.1	4.3	4.8	+0.5
Range	3.0-10.8	3.0-11.6		3.0-11.0	3.0-11.0	
N	324	324		296	296	
	MECHANICS OF ENGLISH			SPELLING		
	June 22	July 27	Differences	June 22	July 27	Differences
Grade Equivalent						
Q3	6.9	7.7	+0.8	7.9	8.1	+0.2
Mdn	6.0	6.8	+0.8	6.9	6.7	-02
Q1	4.8	5.6	+0.8	5.6	5.5	-0.1
Range	3.0-10.9	3.0-12.0		3.3-11.8	3.3-11.8	
N	304	304		313	313	

*Grade equivalent scores.

Looking at the data as a whole one sees a tremendous spread of achievement ranging from the third grade level through the twelfth grade level. Furthermore, all areas showed gains with the exception of spelling. The gains were, in all cases, a good deal greater than would be expected; that is, one month.

Three of the arithmetic teachers administered pre-post arithmetic subtests of the California Achievement Test Battery. This was not a part of the required evaluation. It is noted (Table 19), that achievement level ranges from one year, 2 months to six months below the expected average. However, substantial gains were made, particularly in the Arithmetic Reasoning area. Arithmetic Fundamentals showed less gain. The total range of scores was narrower than in the reading-language areas, the bottom being higher and the top lower (4.3 - 10.4)

TABLE 19
California Achievement Tests
Junior High (Total)

	REASONING			FUNDAMENTALS		
	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Differences	Pre-Test	Post-Test	Differences
Grade Equivalent						
Q3	6.7*	7.4	+0.7	6.7	7.1	+0.4
Mdn	5.9	6.5	+0.6	6.3	6.4	+0.1
Q1	5.4	5.9	+0.5	5.7	5.7	0.0
Range	4.8-9.3	4.3-10.4		4.3-8.6	4.3-9.8	
N	99	99		97	97	

*Grade equivalent scores.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The one striking fact brought out continually in all areas of this evaluation is the overhwelming positive feedback regarding the 1966 summer sessions. Students, teachers, parents, and other school staff were unanimous in their approval of the program, and above all, expressed feelings that growth had occured in the students. This growth was in academic areas as well as general increased motivation and interest in school. The enrichment activities were widely acclaimed for their interest as well as cultural value. Academic growth was observed in objective achievement tests. This growth ranged from remarkable to negligible and in one case regression. However, on the whole, gains tended to show more than a month-for-month growth. Furthermore, these are students whose academic growth has been less than month-for-month as indicated by their present low achievement level.

It is obvious that three of the four primary objectives of the summer school program were achieved. First of all, achievement levels increased; secondly, aspiration and motivation for learning seemed to have increased as indicated by teacher and parent comments; and thirdly, the experiential background of students was enriched.

The fourth objective, that of reducing summer school learning losses, is not measurable at this time. It could only be evaluated by means of a follow-up study.

Although the major objectives were achieved there were some negative aspects of the summer school program. Standing out among these is the dropout and absence rate. Both were high. Attempts were made to discover causes of school leaving. A number of factors evolved such as: proportionately more ninth graders left school than either seventh or eighth graders, non-academic class combinations, and strictness of adherence to the three day absence rule. Actual reasons for leaving school are difficult to obtain and are multi-causal in nature. Certainly teacher factors and screening methods contribute no small amount to this pattern. The related issue of absence rate (50 or more per day) was not examined. Again, there are a multitude of factors impinging upon this. One wonders how evaluation ratings of dropout students and their parents would compare with those obtained from the "stay" sample.

Undoubtedly there is a relationship between this data and the incidence of discipline problems. Also tied in are comments from teachers and the principal regarding screening and section of students. There was a prevailing feeling that more students who did not care to be there, or had little intention of trying to improve themselves, were present during this summer session than had been the case in the 1965 session. It is suggested that screening and selection methods be carefully examined. Student participation in this might prove fruitful. Furthermore, it might be worthwhile to examine incentives to regular attendance.

The other element of summer school most criticized was the length of class periods. Many teachers mentioned this and suggested three shorter class periods.

A statement by the principal cogently summarizes much of the feeling regarding the value of the summer session:

> It was a satisfactory and rewarding six weeks - classes operated in a less formal and rigid atmosphere; youngsters felt free to express themselves more; students were more relaxed and ready to admit short comings and seek help as compared to regular school year when there is strong competition that they many times give up. There are also many intangibles that are difficult to evaluate - the social growth, the making of new friends, growth in tolerance and acceptance of new people, the comfortable feeling of having teachers, counselors and other ready and willing to help them - of people having time for them.

A final question remains. Will the experiences of summer school carry over into the regular school setting? Will these students progress and adjust at a higher rate than similar students who did not attend summer school? Although much of the growth attained as a result of the summer school experience is intangible and difficult to measure, some tangible outcomes must be observed.

RMG:mh
9/22/66
Approved: Alden W. Badal
Director of Research

Rolf M. Godon
Teacher on Special Assignment
Research Department

HAMILTON JR. HIGH SUMMER SCHOOL — Appendix A

SUMMER - 1966

We have to take a count of students from each school isted below. Take a count of students on your register effective Tues., June 28th. Please return to office Thurs., June 30th.

*		**	
20	Claremont	10	
10	Elmhurst	25	1
15	Frick	18	2
30	Hamilton	54	10
20	Westlake	6	1
20	Havenscourt	24	4
10	Hoover	2	
15	Lowell	0	
15	Madison	37	2
3	Horace Mann	5	2
60	Roosevelt	44	7
15	Webster	9	
5	Whittier	3	1
10	Bella Vista	14	2
14	Brookfield	14	2
10	Ralph Bunche	0	
10	Clawson	0	
5	Cole	0	
10	Durant	1	1
10	Franklin	3	1
15	Garfield	11	
7	Woodland	2	
5	Golden Gate	4	
10	Hammarskjold	9	1
10	Highland	6	2
1	Parker	1	

*		**	***
10	Hawthorne	6	1
15	Lazear	16	3
3	Lincoln	4	
10	Lockwood	10	8
6	Longfellow	4	
15	Manzanita	8	2
10	Santa Fe	7	
10	Prescott	0	
4	Sobrante Park	9	4
12	Stonehurst	16	1
10	Washington	6	
10	Willow Manor	0	
8	St. Anthony	9	
4	St. Benedict's	5	
4	St. Louis	6	
4	St. Cyril	5	
5	St. Jarlath	7	2
5	St. Mary's	4	1
1	San Andreas	1	
2	Corpus Christi	2	
3	Lady of Lourdes	2	
4	St. Augustine	2	
3	St. Elizabeth	2	
1	St. Lawrence	1	
2	St. Leo	4	2
3	Markham	0	1

*		**	***
15	McChesney	10	2
2	Emerson	0	
2	Peralta	0	
3	Grant	2	1
5	Lafayette		
8	Melrose	5	
2	Jefferson		
2	Cox	1	
2	Edison	0	
15	Allendale	12	4
21	Woodrow	15	
3	King	2	
13	Bret Harte	10	4
2	Piedmont	1	
1	Montera	1	

Total 502

Junior High 190

Elementary 272

Parochial 40

	Boys	Girls
7th Grade	151	121
8th Grade	46	43
9th Grade	66	75

*Total applicants received
**Count actually attending
***Dropouts

Form EOA-ESEA

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

Appendix B1

Teacher's Evaluation of Secondary Summer School, 1966

For each of the general objectives of Summer School, please indicate your rating of the results which were actually achieved with a majority of the students in your classes. Place a check (✓) mark in the appropriate column for each of the items listed below:

AREAS RATED	Marked Improvement	Satisfactory Improvement	Minimal Improvement	No Improvement
1. Reading a. Vocabulary				
b. Comprehension				
2. Language a. Oral				
b. Written				
3. Study Habits				
4. Educational Motivation				

5. Rating of subject matter growth in your teaching area. (Use Period 1 section for both classes if courses are the same.)

a. Title of First Period Course _____

Enrollment as of 7/27/66 _____

AREAS RATED	Marked Improvement	Satisfactory Improvement	Minimal Improvement	No Improvement
Understanding of course content				
Performance in class				
Appreciation of course content				

b. Title of Second Period Course _____

Enrollment as of 7/27/66 _____
(Use only if course is different from 5a above.)

Understanding of course content
Performance in class
Appreciation of course content

6. Please cite the features of this year's program that helped you the most to do effective work with your students.

_____

_____

_____

7. Please indicate the factors which may have limited the effectiveness of your work with children.

_____

_____

_____

8. Please give a brief description of the enrichment activities (excursions, assemblies, etc.) in which your classes participated during the summer.

a. Activities away from school site_____

_____

b. Schoolwide activities_____

_____

9. In general, how valuable do you find the enrichment activities were to your students as learning experiences?

Extremely Valuable	Quite Valuable	Somewhat Valuable	Little or No Value
☐	☐	☐	☐

10. Please comment on the instructional techniques that you found most effective.

_____

_____

11. What instructional materials did you find most useful?

_____

_____

12. What suggestions do you have for improving Summer School next year?

_____

_____

13. Do you feel that the free food provided between classes is of value?

____ Yes ___No

(Explain)_____

ESEA - EOA - Sec.

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

Appendix B2

STUDENT EVALUATION OF SECONDARY SUMMER SCHOOLS, 1966

We are interested in what you think and how you feel about your experiences in Summer School. Please answer the questions below and return this form to your teacher. Thank you.

A. Please check if you are a BOY ☐ or a GIRL ☐

B.. Grade, in 1965-1966 school year ☐

C. How much did you like coming to Summer School?

Very Much	It Was All Right	Not Very Much	Not at All
☐	☐	☐	☐

D. How much do you feel that you have learned during the summer?

A great deal	Quite a bit	A little	Nothing
☐	☐	☐	☐

E. Would you advise your friends to come to Summer School next year?

_____Yes _____No

F. What three things did you like most about Summer School?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

G. What three things did you like the least about Summer School?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

ESEA-EOA - Jr. High

OAKLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Research Department

Appendix B3

Parent Evaluation of the Junior High Summer Schools, 1966

Dear Parent:

We are interested in your opinions and feelings about your child's experiences in Summer School. Please answer the following questions and ask your son or daughter to return this form in the envelope provided. Thank you.

1. Please check (✓) whether your child is a BOY ☐ or a GIRL ☐

2. Grade, (in the 1965-1966 school year) _____.

3. How much do you feel your child has gained from his Summer School courses? Please list below the courses your son or daughter has taken in Summer School and indicate your answer by placing a check (✓) in the appropriate column.

SUBJECTS TAKEN IN SUMMER SCHOOL	A great deal	Quite a bit	Not Very Much	Nothing
A.				
B.				

4. One of the major goals has been to improve reading skills. How much do you feel your child has improved in this area?

A great deal	Quite a bit	Not very much	No improvement
☐	☐	☐	☐

5. If funds are available next year, would you be interested in having your child attend Summer School?

_____YES _____NO

6. In what ways has Summer School helped your child?

_____

_____

7. In what ways do you feel the Summer School program can be improved?

_____

_____

Appendix C1

Analysis of 1966 EOA Summer School Teacher Ratings by Type of Class Taught

SUBJECT	Marked Improvement	Satisfactory Improvement	Minimal Improvement	No Improvement
Language Arts				
Understanding	7	11	2	
Performance	11	6	2	1
Appreciation	6	13	1	
TOTAL	24(40%)	30(50%)	5(8%)	1(2%)
Mathematics				
Understanding	4	6		
Performance		9	1	
Appreciation	3	6	1	
TOTAL	7(23%)	21(70%)	2(7%)	
Homemaking				
Understanding	2			1
Performance	2		1	
Appreciation	2			1
TOTAL	6(67%)		1(11%)	2(22%)
Wood Shop				
Understanding		1		
Performance		1		
Appreciation	1			
TOTAL	1(33%)	2(67%)		
Art				
Understanding	1	1		
Performance		2		
Appreciation	1	1		
TOTAL	2(33%)	4(67%)		